



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ST  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/258,302	02/26/1999	MASAYUKI INOUE	501.36884X00	3656

20457 7590 07/10/2002

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS  
SUITE 1800  
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

LASTRA, DANIEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/258,302

Applicant(s)

INOUE ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL LASTRA

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3622

1. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Mori et al (U.S. 5,659,166).

As per claim 12, Mori et al teach:

A point management system comprising:

a point system management apparatus which manages and registers a store which participates in a point system (see column 8, lines 21-67; column 11, lines 54-67 – column 12, lines 1-15).

an IC card having a memory having a plurality of point storage areas storing point data which is assigned corresponding to a customer's use and a point management application which manages access to said memory (see column 11, lines 54-67 – column 1-15); and

a reading and writing apparatus which reads and writes said IC card by using key data provided by said point system management apparatus (see column 4, lines 62-67 – column 1-15).

As per claim 19, Mori et al teach:

A reading and writing apparatus which reads and writes point data of an IC card, wherein the reading and writing apparatus accesses one point management application of said IC card by using key data which is originally provided for a registered store (see column 11, lines 54-67 – column 12, lines 1-15).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al (U.S. 5,659,166) in view of Takaragi et al (U.S. 4,885,788).

As per claim 1, Mori et al teach:

An IC card comprising

a memory having a point storage areas storing point data which are assigned corresponding to a customer's use (see column 8, lines 21-31). Mori et al fail to teach a plurality of storage areas. However, Takaragi et al teach an IC card with different transaction areas. Therefore, a given store is permitted to process only the transaction areas that correspond to the encrypted area held by the store from among the plurality of transaction areas contained in the IC card (see column 1, lines 20-25; column 2, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that the Mori IC card would use the Takaragi system to have different transaction areas corresponding to the different

stores, as taught by Takaragi. This feature would allow the Mori IC card to be used for different stores without the need to carry a different card for each store.

Mori et al teach a point management application which manages access to said memory (see column 4, lines 47-67 – column 5, lines 1-15).

As per claim 2, Mori et al fail to teach, an IC card according to claim 1, wherein said point management application distinguishes data transmitted from a reading and writing apparatus of several stores and records points in an area to record then within said plurality of point storage areas of said memory. However, Takaragi et al teach an IC card with transaction areas that are different depending upon the store, so that one store is not allowed to make reference to the transaction of other stores. Therefore, a given store is permitted to process only the transaction areas that correspond to the encrypted area held by the store from among the plurality of transaction areas contained in the IC card (see column 1, lines 20-25; column 2, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that the Mori IC card would use the Takaragi system to have different transaction areas corresponding to different stores, as taught by Takaragi. This feature would allow the Mori IC card to be used for different stores without the need to carry a different card for each store.

As per claim 3, Mori et al fail to teach, an IC card according to claim 2, wherein said point management application allows access to an area that corresponds to transmitted data and prohibits access to other areas. However, Takaragi teaches an IC card where a given store is permitted to process only the transaction areas that

Art Unit: 3622

correspond to the encrypted data held by that store from among the plurality of transaction areas contained in the IC card (see column 2, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Mori would implement the feature of having different transaction areas depending upon the store, so that a particular store is not allowed to make reference to transactions areas of other stores. This feature would permit the Mori point card to be used for different stores and would help in obviating the use of different cards for different stores.

As per claim 4, Mori et al fail to teach an IC card according to claim 2, wherein said point management application allows writing of point data into an area that corresponds to transmitted data, while prohibiting writing to other areas, and reads point data from both an area that corresponds to transmitted data and another store area. However, Takaragi teaches an IC card with transaction areas that are different depending upon the store, so that one store is not allowed to make reference to the transaction of other stores (see column 1, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know Mori would implement the feature of having an IC card with different transaction areas that would prohibit one store to change the data of another store, as taught by Takaragi. This feature would allow the IC card to be used for different stores as one store would not have accessed to the data of another store.

As per claim 5, Mori et al teach:

An IC card according to claim 2, wherein said point management application subtracts point data and rewrites subtracted point data when points are redeemed (see column 11, lines 54-67 – column 12, lines 1-15).

As per claim 6, Mori et al teaches:

An IC card according to claim 2, said point management application comprising;  
a point data processing unit which calculates transmitted point data (see column 11, lines 54-67 – column 12, lines 1-15).

Mori et al fail to teach:

a crypt data processing unit which processes transmitted crypt data;  
and a control unit which controls said crypt data processing unit and said point data processing unit,  
wherein said control unit controls accessing of said point storing area.

However, Takaragi et al teach of data, such as the name of merchandise and the amount of money, which is encrypted with encipher keys codes that are different for each of the stores, and are written onto the IC card. Therefore, the transaction data used in one store, is kept secret from other stores, and the privacy of the user is protected (see column 8, lines 25-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Mori would use crypt technology to encipher the data and make it more secure, as taught by Takaragi. This feature would allow the card to be used for different stores as the data of one store is kept secret from other stores.

As per claim 8, Mori et al teach:

An IC card according to claim 2, further comprising an application, which manages personal data, wherein said memory has a personal data area which stores personal data (see figure 7).

As per claim 9, Mori et al teach:

An IC card according to claim 2, further comprising an application which executes electronic money liquidation (see column 11, lines 1-15).

As per claim 10, Mori et al teach:

An IC card according to claim 2, further comprising an application which executes credit liquidation (see column 9, lines 24-34).

As per claim 11, Mori et al fail to teach, an IC card according to claim 2, wherein "said plurality of point data provided by respective stores and include a group point storage area which stores group point data used by several stores, and said point management application writes said point data into both said point storage areas and group point storage areas when point data is issued by a store." However, Takaragi teaches an IC card with different transaction areas, so that one store is not allowed to access the transaction data of other stores (see column 1, lines 20-25). Takaragi does not expressly teach a group transaction area where several stores would save their transaction data, however, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that if Takaragi has different transaction areas in the same IC card, it would have one transaction area that would be used by several stores. The several stores would have the same encipher key to access



that area and would save their data in the same transaction area (see column 2, lines 17-25). This feature would help stores share data between them.

As per claim 13, Mori et al fail to teach, a point management system according to claim 12, wherein said point management application distinguishes data transmitted from the reading and writing apparatus of several stores and records points in an area within said plurality of point storage areas of said memory. However, Takaragi et al teach an IC card with transaction areas that are different depending upon the store, so that one store is not allowed to make reference to transaction data of other stores. Therefore, a given store is permitted to process only the transaction areas that correspond to the encrypted area held by the store from among the plurality of transaction areas contained in the IC card (see column 1, lines 20-25; column 2, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that the Mori IC card would use the Takaragi system to have different transaction areas corresponding to the different stores and records points and balances of different stores, as taught by Takaragi. This feature would allow the Mori IC card to be used for different stores without the need to carry a different card for each store that is to be used.

As per claim 14, Mori et al fail to teach:

A point management system according to claim 13, wherein said point system management apparatus provides a register store number and crypt key to a store participating in said point system, said reading and writing apparatus accesses said IC cards by using crypt data which includes said register store number and said crypt key,

and said point management application determines whether access to said reading and writing apparatus is to be allowed by distinguishing said crypt data transmitted from said reading and writing apparatus. However, Takaragi et al teach of an IC card where a given store is permitted to process only the transaction areas that correspond to the encipher key and the decipher key held by that store from among the plurality of transaction areas contained in the IC card. This makes it possible to protect the privacy of the user (see column 2, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Mori would have different transactions areas in his IC card, and each transaction area would be encrypted so that a given store is permitted to process only the transaction areas that correspond to the encipher keys. This feature would protect the privacy of the users as different stores would not have access to data from other stores even though the same IC card is being used.

As per claim 15, Mori et al teach:

A point management system according to claim 13, said point management application comprising;

a point data processing unit which calculates transmitted point data (see column 11, lines 54-67 – column 12, lines 1-15).

Mori et al fail to teach:

a crypt data processing unit which processes transmitted crypt data and a control unit which controls said crypt data processing unit and said point data processing unit, wherein said control unit controls accessing of said point storing area. However,

Takaragi et al teach an IC card with different transaction areas that are different depending upon the store, and where a given store is permitted to process only the transaction areas that correspond to the encipher key and the decipher key held by that store from among the plurality of transaction areas contained in the IC card (see column 1, lines 20-25 and column 2, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Mori would have different transaction areas in the IC card that would store the points of different stores and the transactions would be encrypted so that only the store that has the correct decipher key would be able to write and read in the particular transaction area. This feature would allow the Mori card to be used in different stores without the risk of having one store access private information from another store.

As per claim 16, Mori et al teach:

A point management system according to claim 15, wherein said reading and writing apparatus transmits an order for subtracting points from said IC card, said point data processing unit subtracts point data, and said control unit rewrites resulting point data to said memory (see column 11, lines 54-67 – column 12, lines 1-15).

As per claim 17, Mori et al teach:

A point management system according to claim 15, further comprising a personal computer which reads point data from said IC card, and transmits said point data to said reading and writing apparatus set up in an internet store through a telephone line (see column 7, lines 30-35).

As per claim 20, Mori et al teach:

A point system management apparatus which controls a point management system, wherein said point system management apparatus issues key data to access a point management application of an IC card for a store when registering said store (see column 11, lines 17-67 – column 12, lines 1-15). Mori et al fail to teach different key data for each store. However, Takaragi et al teach an IC card with transaction areas that are different depending upon the store, so that one store is not allowed to make reference to the transactions of other stores (see column 1, lines 20-25). Also, lines 20-25 of column 2 teach that a given store is permitted to process only the transaction areas that correspond to the encipher and decipher key held by that store from among the plurality of transaction areas contained in the IC card. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Mori would implement the feature of having different transaction areas that are different depending upon the store, as this would make it possible to keep the privacy of the user because the IC card would be used for different stores without one store knowing private information about another store.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al (U.S. 5,659,166) in view of Takaragi et al (U.S. 4,885,788) and further in view of Shimada et al (U.S. 6,012,635).

As per claim 7, Mori et al fail to teach, an IC card according to claim 2, wherein said memory has a history of use storage area which stores the number of times the IC card is used. However, Shimada et al teach a system where previous transactions are read from the card (see column 2, lines 54-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Mori would implement the feature of an IC card with transaction areas that are different depending upon the store, so that one store is not allowed to make reference to the transaction data of other stores, as taught by Takaragi (see column 1, lines 20-25) and would read from the store memory the data stored that indicates previous uses of the IC card, as taught by Shimada. These features would give customers information about past purchases and use of the card to determine the amount of money that is being saved by using the point card.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (U.S. 5,937,391) in view of Kitta et al (U.S. 4,767,920).

As per claim 18, Ikeda et al teach:

A point system management system comprising:

a reference center which references customer's data (see column 2, lines 1-3)

transmits a point data read from said IC card (see column 1, lines 23-36); and

an application center which receives said point data and holds a card number and said point data, wherein said application center conducts a lottery and sends a gift to the winner by using information of said reference center (see column 1, lines 23-36) .

Ikeda et al fail to teach "a vending machine which dispenses goods for exchange of money of an IC card." However, Kitta et al teach the use of vending machines which sell goods using an IC card without the payment of money (see column 1, lines 10-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that the Ikeda IC card would be used in vending

Art Unit: 3622

machines to purchase goods, as taught by Kitta, and to record the number of points in proportion to the number of goods bought. Using IC cards in vending machines would be the same as using them in the point of sale terminals where service points are accumulated by a host system through the POS terminal, each time a customer pays for goods.

### ***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Furuhashi et al teach a system that proposes an account bankbook, money transfer card, receipt file and a checkbook utilizing an optical card, an IC card, or a hybrid optical/IC card.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL LASTRA whose telephone number is 703-306-5933. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ERIC W STAMBER can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

D.L

Daniel Lastra

June 20, 2002

*Steve Gravini for [signature]*  
STEPHEN GRAVINI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER